

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
AUSTIN DIVISION

ANTHONY O. WILSON, §
§
Plaintiff, §
§
v. § 1:23-CV-1074-DII
§
ALLEViate FINANCIAL, LLC, §
§
Defendant. §

ORDER

Before the Court is the report and recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Mark Lane concerning Plaintiff Anthony O. Wilson’s (“Plaintiff”) Motion to Remand, (Dkt. 9). (R. & R., Dkt. 22). Plaintiff received the report and recommendation no later than February 5, 2024. (Dkt. 25). As of the date of this order, no party has filed objections to the report and recommendation.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), a party may serve and file specific, written objections to a magistrate judge’s proposed findings and recommendations within fourteen days after being served with a copy of the report and recommendation and, in doing so, secure de novo review by the district court. When no objections are timely filed, a district court can review the magistrate’s report and recommendation for clear error. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note (“When no timely objection is filed, the [district] court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.”).

Because no party has filed timely objections, the Court reviews the report and recommendation for clear error. Having done so and finding no clear error, the Court accepts and adopts the report and recommendation as its own order.

Accordingly, the Court **ORDERS** that the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge, (Dkt. 22), is **ADOPTED**. Plaintiff's Motion to Remand, (Dkt. 9), is **DENIED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that given his history of asserting frivolous claims despite prior admonishments and/or sanctions, both in this Court and elsewhere,¹ Plaintiff Anthony O. Wilson (Texas Bar No. 24043453) is **PROHIBITED** from filing cases as a *pro se* litigant in the Western District of Texas without the Court's permission.

SIGNED on February 27, 2024.



ROBERT PITMAN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ See, e.g., *Wilson v. First Premier Bank*, No. 19-11704, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 54580, at *5–7 (E.D. Mich. Mar. 30, 2020); *Wilson v. Stockton*, No. 05-CV-74083-DT, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 94975, at *6–7 (E.D. Mich. Sept. 18, 2006) (noting Wilson “seems to be a continually irksome and litigious character” and that plaintiff “has filed more than 20 lawsuits in the last decade”); *Wilson v. Stockton*, No. 05-CV-74083-DT, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 81226, at *4–5 (E.D. Mich. Nov. 6, 2006) (noting Wilson “repeatedly made false statements, repeatedly made financial misrepresentations, and repeatedly filed unsubstantiated complaints”); *Wilson v. Academic Financial Solutions*, No. 05-40361, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 5956, at *12 (E.D. Mich. Jan. 29, 2007) (“After a full consideration of Plaintiff's history in this cause of action, the Court is left with the firm conviction that Plaintiff brought this suit in bad faith.”); *Wilson v. Capital One Bank*, No. 21-1539, 2022 U.S. App. LEXIS 3789 (6th Cir. Feb. 10, 2022) (affirming dismissal of FCRA claim and sanction of court costs and \$2,000 in attorney's fees against Wilson for assertion of frivolous claims).